

REMARKS

Applicants are amending independent Claims 10, 31, 33, 149, 161 and 173 so that they are not limited to a display device. Applicants are also canceling dependent Claims 30, 32, 34, 42, 51, 60, 69, 78, 87, 96, 106, 116, 122, 126, 128, 132, 136, 138, 142, 146, 148, 153, 157, 159, 160, 165, 169, 171, 172, 177, 181, 183 and 184 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants are also adding new dependent Claims 185-196. It is respectfully requested that these amendments and new claims be entered and considered at this time. Please charge our deposit account 50/1039 for any fee due for these new claims.

Applicants have the following response to the Final Rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner continues to reject Claims 1-10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30-91, 93-101, 103-111, and 113-184 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over “applicant’s admitted prior art” in combination with Chen (U.S. 5,453,406), Tang et al. (US 5,550,066) and Hanihara et al. (US 5,990,988). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 1-10, 31, 33, 149, 161 and 173 to specifically recite first and second leveling films and that the second leveling film is thicker than the first leveling film.¹ As explained in the present application, this feature is highly advantageous for leveling the surface over a wiring.

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner admits that “applicant’s admitted prior art” does not

¹ Applicants have also amended some of the dependent claims so that they are consistent with the independent claims.

show the second leveling layer over the first leveling layer. The Examiner, however, cites Chen as showing a second leveling layer 42 over a first leveling layer 40 and contends that Chen teaches that the thickness of the first leveling film 40 is 2000 to 3000 Angstroms and the thickness of the second leveling film 42 is 4000 to 6000 Angstroms. Applicants respectfully submit that this is not what Chen states, or at the very least, Chen is not clear as to the thicknesses of these layers.

In particular, col. 5, line 62 to col. 6, line 9 in Chen states:

“Now referring to FIG. 6, a first spin-on-glass layer 40 is formed over the insulating layer 36 by spin coating. The preferred material used is a spin-on-glass liquid which consist of a silicon-oxide (Si--O) network polymer dissolved in a common organic solvent, such as alcohol, ketones and esters. And more specifically the preferred spin-on-glass material is a series of siloxane base material marketed by the Allied-Signal Corp. under the trade name ACCUGLASS. The preferred material in the series being ACCUGLASS 211, 314 or 311. The primary difference between the spin-on-glass types is the viscosity (solid content). For example, the series 211 has a lower viscosity and produces a thinner coating of about 2000 Angstroms while series 314 and 311 have a higher viscosity and produce coatings of about 3000 Angstroms. (emphasis added)”

Hence, Chen is merely discussing the primary difference between ACCUGLASS 211, 314 or 311.

There is nothing in Chen to indicate what is the actual thickness of layer 40. Instead, this passage merely discusses the differences between these materials, and if the two films are formed under the same conditions except for the difference in starting materials, the film formed from the series 211 is about 2000 Angstroms or the film formed from the series 311 or 314 is about 3000 Angstroms.

At col. 6, lines 10-24 (after the above passage), Chen discusses the conditions under which the first spin-on glass coating 40 is formed (e.g. constant rotational speed of 600 to 800 revolutions per minute, dispensing for about 6 seconds). Chen provides no indication of the resulting thickness of layer 40 under these conditions.

Thereafter, Chen discusses the second layer 42 and states that the same series of spin-on-glass is used for both layers. See col. 6, lines 34-35. Hence, if one followed the discussion at col. 6, lines

4-9 in Chen, the two layers should be the same thickness since they are made of the same material. However, col. 6, line 52-53 state that the thickness of layer 42 is preferably 4000 to 6000 Angstroms which is different than the recitation at col. 6, lns. 6-9.

Further, Chen states that the rotational speed for the first leveling film is 600 to 800 rpm (col. 6, lines 12-15) while the rotational speed for the second leveling film is 2500 to 3000 rpm (col. 6, lines 35-37). As a result, the second leveling film should be thinner than the first leveling film because of the higher rotational speed for the second film. Hence, the Examiner's conclusion on the thickness of these layers appears to be technically incorrect.

Furthermore, there are numerous inconsistencies in Chen regarding the alleged thicknesses of the first and second leveling films, as shown in the chart below.

	leveling film	thickness
specification column 6, lines 52-53	second	4000 to 6000 Angstroms
claim 4	first	2000 to 4000 Angstroms
claim 6	second	2000 to 2500 Angstroms
claim 11	first	4000 to 6000 Angstroms
claim 13	second	2000 to 2500 Angstroms
claim 18	first	2000 to 4000 Angstroms
claim 20	second	2000 to 2500 Angstroms

Hence, the claims do not appear to be supported by the specification.

Therefore, as explained above, the alleged teachings in Chen on the thickness of layers 40 and 42 appear to be unreliable and technically incorrect. As a result, one skilled in the art would not rely upon the statements therein with regard to thicknesses. Hence, Chen cannot be used to show the claimed feature of the present application of wherein said second leveling film is thicker than said first leveling film. Further, none of the other references disclose this feature.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants filed an information disclosure statement (IDS) on January 26, 2006. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered at this time.

Conclusion

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 000026568